

REMARKS

The Examiner stated that this action is a response to applicants' filed September 30, 2003. The Examiner also stated that the response has over the rejection of the claims in the Office Action mailed May 20, 2003. However, claims 54-56 indicated as allowable have been withdrawn after reconsideration for the following reasons.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner stated that Claims 54-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, claim 54 the term "severed" lacks antecedent bases. The Examiner also stated that Claims 1-3, 34 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The coupling apparatus in each of the claims above lacks clear structure and fail to disclose relationship of the elements.

Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 34 and 54-56 to include the necessary structural connections. Furthermore, the Applicant has modified claims 54-56 to solve the lack for antecedent bases. Applicant believes that these claims are now in form for issuance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has stated that Claims 6-10, 14, 17-33 and 38-47 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended claims 6-10,14, 17-33 and 38-47-53 in an independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant believes that these claims are now in form for issuance.

The Examiner stated that Claims 11-13, 15-16 and 48-53 are allowable over the art of record and therefore are in the form for issuance.